

Partner Projects 2025-26

Assessment Criteria and Scoring Framework

Partner Projects are an annual funding initiative designed to support collaborations between Wikimedia Australia, external organisations and/or volunteer Wikimedians. The program aims to enable high-impact projects that align with Wikimedia Australia's strategic priorities, particularly in the areas of equity, inclusion, and capacity building. Partner Projects may involve content creation, training and outreach, technology development, or other initiatives that contribute positively to the Wikimedia ecosystem in Australia. See previous examples on Wikimedia Australia's [Projects & Partnerships webpage](#).

This Framework Guideline document is designed to guide both applicants and assessors through the evaluation process for Wikimedia Australia's Partner Projects.

All proposals will be reviewed against four key dimensions:

1. **Relevance** – Alignment with Wikimedia Australia's strategy, purpose, and values
2. **Foreseeable Risks** – The level of risk associated with delivering the proposed activities
3. **Success and Impact** – The potential for the project to succeed and deliver meaningful outcomes
4. **Other Considerations** – The strength and reliability of the partnership, including the capacity and accountability of partners / partner organisations

Each dimension will be scored on a 7-point scale from Harmful (-3) to Critical (+3) based on the criteria described below. A detailed explanation for each score is included to support consistent, fair and transparent assessment.

The purpose of this scoring framework is to ensure all project proposals are assessed equitably, with a focus on strategic alignment, feasibility, and potential community impact.

How to Use This Framework

For applicants: This document outlines how your proposal will be evaluated. Use the criteria and scoring explanations to guide your application, addressing any areas that could raise concerns or strengthen alignment with Wikimedia Australia's goals.

For assessors: Assess each proposal by completing the decision-making rubric. For each dimension, add a note in the relevant cell explaining your rationale - such as how well the proposed activity aligns with Wikimedia Australia's strategy, the risks involved, the likelihood of success, and any other relevant considerations. Assign a corresponding score based on the definitions provided.

Once all dimensions have been assessed, total the scores to determine the overall Suitability Score. Use the following thresholds to guide your recommendation:

Total Suitability Score	Recommendation
15 or more	Accept, provided WMAU commitments (e.g. budget, staff time) remain within scope. Otherwise, defer to the EO/Board.
10–14	Accept if within scope. If not, defer to the Board for decision.
7–9	Accept only if additional capacity is available. If not, recommend adjusting the proposal or rejecting it.
6 or less	Reject.

Important: If any significant risks or partnership concerns arise that could undermine the success of the proposed activities, the proposal should be deferred to the EO and/or Board, regardless of score.

Priority (and score)	Relevance	Foreseeable risks	Score: #	Success and impact	Other considerations
		Likelihood	Impact		
Critical (+ 3)					
Very high (+ 2)					
High (+ 1)					
Medium (0)					
Low (- 1)					
Very low (- 2)					
Harmful (- 3)					
Suitability scores:	Score: #	Score: #	Score: #	Score: #	Score: #
Total suitability score:	#	Recommendation:		Accept/Reject/Defer to EO/Board/Other	

	Priority (and score)	Description
Relevance This dimension is designed to determine the strategic fit and values alignment of the proposed activities and their contribution to Wikimedia Australia's purpose.	Critical (+ 3)	The proposed activities will make a profound contribution to multiple Key Actions under two or more Pillars. The proposed activities embody Wikimedia Australia's values and they contribute significantly to our purpose and/or create significant benefits for members, our community and stakeholders.
	Very high (+ 2)	The proposed activities will make a significant contribution to multiple Key Actions under a single Pillar. The proposed activities align closely to Wikimedia Australia's values and they contribute to our purpose and/or create benefits for members, our community and stakeholders.

	Priority (and score)	Description
	High (+ 1)	The proposed activities will make a significant contribution to a single Key Actions under a single Pillar. The proposed activities are aligned with Wikimedia Australia's values and they contribute to our purpose and/or create benefits for members, our community and stakeholders.
	Medium (0)	The proposed activities are reasonably aligned with multiple Key Actions under two or more Pillars. The proposed activities do not detract from Wikimedia Australia's values and they contribute to our purpose and/or create benefits for members, our community and stakeholders.
	Low (- 1)	The proposed activities are tangentially aligned with one or more Key Actions under one or more Pillars. The alignment of the proposed activities with Wikimedia Australia's values is weak. How the proposed activities contribute to our purpose and/or create benefits for members, our community and stakeholders is limited.
	Very low (- 2)	The proposed activities are poorly aligned or not aligned with any Key Actions. The alignment of the proposed activities with Wikimedia Australia's values is very weak. How the proposed activities contribute to our purpose and/or create benefits for members, our community and stakeholders is unclear.
	Harmful (- 3)	The proposed activities will detract from or undermine one or more Key Actions. There is almost no alignment between the proposed activities and Wikimedia Australia's values. The proposed activities do not contribute to our purpose and/or do not create benefits for members, our community and stakeholders is limited.
Foreseeable risks This dimension is designed to determine how risky the proposed activities are.	Critical (+ 3)	No foreseeable risks exist, or a small number of foreseeable risks exist (i.e. < 5), and none are major or catastrophic risks.
	Very high (+ 2)	A small number of foreseeable risks exist (i.e. < 5). Of those, no more than one is a major risk but no catastrophic risks exist.
	High (+ 1)	A small number of foreseeable risks exist (i.e. < 5). Of those, less than three are a major risk but no catastrophic risks exist.
	Medium (0)	Some foreseeable risks exist (i.e. 6–10). Of those, more than three are a major risk but no catastrophic risks exist.
	Low (- 1)	Some foreseeable risks exist (i.e. 6–10). Of those, less than three are a major risk and no more than one is a catastrophic risk.

		Priority (and score)	Description
		Very low (- 2)	Many foreseeable risks exist (i.e. 10+). Of those, four or more are major risks and/or more than one is a catastrophic risk.
		Harmful (- 3)	Many foreseeable risks exist (i.e. 10+). Of those, the majority are major or catastrophic risks.
	Likelihood This dimension is designed to determine how likely foreseeable risks will occur.	Critical (+ 3)	If foreseeable risks exist, they are very unlikely to occur. There is little or no historical precedent and/or there is no reason to expect the risks will occur.
		Very high (+ 2)	The foreseeable risks are unlikely to occur. There is some evidence these types of risks have impacted similar projects in the past but there is little reason to expect the risks will occur.
		High (+ 1)	It is possible the foreseeable risks could occur, but it is not probable they will.
		Medium (0)	The foreseeable risks are likely to occur. There is some evidence these types of risks have impacted similar projects in the past but there is little reason to expect the risks will occur.
		Low (- 1)	The foreseeable risks are likely to occur. There is significant evidence these types of risks have impacted similar projects in the past and there is some reason to expect the risks will occur.
		Very low (- 2)	The foreseeable risks are very likely to occur. There is significant evidence these types of risks have impacted similar projects in the past and there is significant reason to expect the risks will occur.
		Harmful (- 3)	The foreseeable risks are almost certain to occur. There is aggravated risk where these risks are expected to occur frequently.
	Impact This dimension is designed to the severity of the impact of foreseeable risks if they do occur.	Critical (+ 3)	If foreseeable risks exist, and they occur, they would not cause any disruption to the proposed activities and would not incur any additional costs. Manageable avoidance measures exist for all risks and/or if the risks did occur, manageable mitigation strategies can be deployed for each risk to minimise its impact.
		Very high (+ 2)	If the foreseeable risks did occur, they would cause nominal disruption to the proposed activities and would only incur very minor additional costs. Manageable avoidance measures exist for the majority of risks and/or if the risks did occur, manageable mitigation strategies can be deployed to minimise the impact of the majority of them.
		High (+ 1)	If the foreseeable risks did occur, they would cause some disruption to the proposed activities

		Priority (and score)	Description
			and would only incur minor additional costs. Manageable avoidance measures exist for the majority of risks and/or if the risks did occur, manageable mitigation strategies can be deployed to minimise the impact of the majority of them.
		Medium (0)	If the foreseeable risks did occur, they would cause some disruption to the proposed activities but would incur additional costs. Manageable avoidance measures exist for some of the risks and/or if the risks did occur, manageable mitigation strategies can be deployed to minimise the impact of some of them.
		Low (- 1)	If the foreseeable risks did occur, they would cause significant disruption to the proposed activities and/or would incur significant additional costs. Manageable avoidance measures exist for some of the risks and/or if the risks did occur, manageable mitigation strategies can be deployed to minimise the impact of some of them.
		Very low (- 2)	If the foreseeable risks did occur, they would cause severe disruption to the proposed activities and would incur large additional costs. The majority of risks do not have manageable avoidance measures and/or there are no manageable mitigation strategies that can be deployed to minimise the impact of the majority of them.
		Harmful (- 3)	If the foreseeable risks did occur, they would cause critical failure. Almost all of the risks do not have manageable avoidance measures and/or there are no manageable mitigation strategies that can be deployed to minimise the impact of almost all of them. The risks pose an existential risk to the proposed activities.
Success and impact This dimension is designed to determine the potential impact the proposed activities could have and how likely Wikimedia Australia will enjoy that success.		Critical (+ 3)	The likelihood of the proposed activities having their intended impact is almost certain to occur. If successful, the proposed activities stand to have a profound impact on addressing the issue/problem while holding Wikimedia Australia up as an exemplary player in the Wikimedia community.
		Very high (+ 2)	The likelihood of the proposed activities having their intended impact is very likely to occur. If successful, the proposed activities stand to have a significant impact on addressing the issue/problem while reflecting very positively on Wikimedia Australia.
		High (+ 1)	The likelihood of the proposed activities having their intended impact is likely to occur. If successful, the proposed activities stand to have a reasonable impact on addressing the issue/problem while reflecting positively on Wikimedia Australia.

	Priority (and score)	Description
	Medium (0)	The likelihood of the proposed activities having their intended impact is uncertain. If successful, the proposed activities stand to have a modest but worthwhile impact on the issue/problem and do not stand to reflect negatively on Wikimedia Australia.
	Low (- 1)	The likelihood of the proposed activities having their intended impact is unlikely to occur. If successful, the proposed activities stand to have a nominal impact on the issue/problem and/or the proposed activities may reflect negatively on Wikimedia Australia.
	Very low (- 2)	The likelihood of the proposed activities having their intended impact is very unlikely to occur. Even if successful, the proposed activities will have almost no or no impact on the issue/problem and/or a negative perception of Wikimedia Australia as a result of the proposed activities may be significant.
	Harmful (- 3)	The likelihood of the proposed activities having their intended impact is almost certain not to occur. Success or failure will have no impact on the issue/problem and/or a negative perception of Wikimedia Australia as a result of the proposed activities may be severe.
Other considerations This dimension is designed to capture any other factors that should be considered when assessing the suitability of the proposed activities.	Critical (+ 3)	Partners bring unique, complementary skills or resources to the table. Partners are enthusiastically committed to the proposed activities. Partners have contributed financial or other resources matching or exceeding Wikimedia Australia's contributions. The partner's reliability, trustworthiness and accountability is evident and unquestionable. How communication and reporting during the partnership will be handled is robust, well documented and complied with, including clear channels for information sharing and giving and getting feedback.
	Very high (+ 2)	Partners bring significant needed skills or resources to the table. Partners are very committed to the proposed activities. Partners have contributed in-kind resources on par with Wikimedia Australia's contributions. The partner is highly reliable, trustworthy and accountable. The partnership has high-level and operational communication and reporting processes outlined.
	High (+ 1)	Partners bring some needed skills or resources to the table. Partners are committed to the proposed activities. Partners have contributed in-kind resources on par with Wikimedia Australia's contributions. The partner is reliable, trustworthy and accountable. The partnership has operational communication and reporting processes outlined, but lacks clarity of high-level communications and reporting requirements.
	Medium (0)	Partners do not bring anything new to the table. Partners are generally committed to the proposed activities. The parity of partners' contributions in comparison to Wikimedia Australia's contributions are difficult to ascertain. The extent to which the partner is very highly reliable,

	Priority (and score)	Description
		trustworthy and accountable is difficult to ascertain. The partnership has basic communication and reporting processes outlined with some uncertainty related to communications and reporting requirements.
	Low (- 1)	Weaknesses on the part of partners are not balanced by Wikimedia Australia's strengths. Partners are noncommittal towards the proposed activities. Wikimedia Australia is carrying more of the burden for the proposed activities. The reliability, trustworthiness and accountability is poor. The partnership has limited communication and reporting processes outlined, with significant uncertainty related to communications and reporting requirements.
	Very low (- 2)	The partners exhibit significant weaknesses, further requiring the burden for the proposed activities to be carried by Wikimedia Australia to overcome. Partners are actively working against the proposed activities. On at least one occasion the partner has demonstrated unreliability, untrustworthiness and a lack of accountability. The partnership has very limited or no communication and reporting processes outlined.
	Harmful (- 3)	Partners are ill-equipped to deliver the proposed activities without Wikimedia Australia significantly picking up the slack. Partners are actively undermining the potential for the project to succeed. The partner has demonstrated significant and repeated unreliability, untrustworthiness and a lack of accountability. Important aspects of the partnership, such as communication and reporting, have not been determined.